

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 9, 2007 and the Advisory Action dated April 4, 2007 have been received and their contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 15-18, 20 and 21 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 15-18, 20 and 21 are amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 15-18, 20 and 21 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6-8, 15, 16, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,677,704 to Kusano et al. (hereinafter “Kusano”) and claims 5, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusano in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,775,891 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter “Aoki”).

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-8, 15, 16, 18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kusano is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicant submits that Kusano does not disclose either explicitly or inherently each and every element recited in these claims of the present application.

Independent claim 1 recites method of driving a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “receiving and registering first source data for a first frame period; receiving second source data for a second frame period subsequent to the first frame period, the second frame period having a predetermined duration; [and] generating modulated data according to a comparison result between the registered first source data and the second source data.” Applicant submits that Kusano does not disclose at least these recited features. For example Kusano disclose in Table 2 and Table 3, as well as in the circuit shown in FIG. 3, using the data of a single frame (30A, 30B, 30C, and 30D) in combination with frame count signals to generate frame data (3-bit data at output). Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kusano does not teach “generating modulated data according to a comparison result between the registered first source data and the second source data” where the registered first source data and the second data are “first source data for a first frame period” and “second source data for a second frame period subsequent to the first frame period” respectively as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kusano does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claim 7 recites an apparatus for driving a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “a modulator that receives and registers first source data for a first frame period, receives second source data for a second frame period subsequent to the first frame period, the second frame period having a predetermined duration, and that generates modulated data according to a comparison result between the registered first source data and the second source data.” The Examiner rejects claim 7 using the same rationale given for claim 1. Applicant submits that Kusano fails to disclose each of the features recited in claim 7 for the same reasons given for claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kusano does not anticipate claim 7.

Applicant notes that claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 15, and 16 depend respectively from claims 1 and 7 and each includes, by reference, all of the elements of their respective base claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kusano does not anticipate claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 15, and 16 at least by way of the dependencies of the claims, and for the reasons given above for their respective base claims 1, and 7.

Independent claim 18 recites a liquid crystal display including a modulator having a similar combination of features to those discussed above for claim 7. The Examiner rejects claim 18 using the same rationale given for claim 7, additionally noting that Kusano discloses a liquid crystal display panel as recited in claim 18. Applicant submits Kusano does not disclose at least “a modulator that receives and registers first source data for a first frame period, receives second source data for a second frame period subsequent to the first frame period, the second frame period having a predetermined duration, and that generates modulated source data using the registered first source data and the second source data” as recited in claim 18 for the reasons given above for claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kusano does not anticipate claim 18.

Independent claim 21 recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “applying a modulated data signal to a liquid crystal panel within one frame period; and wherein the modulated data signal has a voltage level larger than that of the data signal, and wherein the modulated data signal is generated depending on a comparison result between data from a frame period previous to the one frame period and data from the one frame period.” Applicant submits that Kusano does not disclose at least a modulated signal “wherein the modulated data signal has a voltage level larger than that of the

data signal, and wherein the modulated data signal depends on data from a frame period previous to the one frame period and on data from the one frame period.” Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kusano does not anticipate claim 21.

The rejection of claims 5, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusano in view of Aoki is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicant notes that claims 5, 17, and 20 depend respectively from claims 1, 7, and 18 and that each includes by reference all of the limitations of the respective base claims.

As Applicant has discussed above, Kusano does not anticipate claims 5, 17, and 20. The Examiner cites Aoki as allegedly curing deficiencies explicitly recited in claims 5, 17, and 20. Applicant does not reach the Examiner’s conclusions regarding the teachings of Aoki. Applicant submits that Aoki does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Kusano regarding the combination of features of claims 1, 7, and 18 as discussed above. Applicant submits that Kusano and Aoki, analyzed singly or in any combination, do not teach or suggest the combined features of claims 1, 7, and 18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7, and 18, and claims 5, 17, and 20 depending respectively from claims 1, 7, and 18 are each allowable over Kusano and Aoki.

Applicant believes the above amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37

C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 7, 2007

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 7, 2007

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant